

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

TERI KEALOHA SAHM,

Plaintiff,

v.

KARIM ALI, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C22-1131-RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The instant matter comes before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff Teri Kealoha Sahn's Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt. #75. The Court has determined that it can rule on this Motion without responsive briefing.

"Motions for reconsideration are disfavored." LCR 7(h)(1). "The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.*

Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its Order Dismissing Case and Granting Motion for Vexatious Litigant Order (Dkt. #73) and its Judgment granting Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and dismissing Plaintiff's case with prejudice as to all parties (Dkt. #74). Plaintiff submits, as "new facts," that she was unable to locate a "valid public Oath of Office for Bradford Moore" and that King County Superior Court Commissioner Bradford Moore, who signed the writ of

1 restitution in the previous unlawful detainer action filed against Plaintiff for refusing to vacate  
2 the Property at issue, is therefore “impersonating an officer.” Dkt. #75 at 2. Plaintiff argues that  
3 the writ of restitution Commissioner Moore signed is thereby a “criminal” act and as such an  
4 “illegal and unlawful taking under the recent Supreme Court case *Tyler v. Minnesota* No. 12-  
5 166.” The Court has reviewed *Tyler v. Hennepin Cnty., Minnesota*, 598 U.S. 631 (2023), in  
6 which a taxpayer brought an action against Hennepin County in Minnesota state court alleging  
7 the county’s retention of the \$25,000 in excess proceeds from the sale of her condominium for  
8 \$40,000 to satisfy her delinquent \$15,000 property tax bill was a taking of property without just  
9 compensation, in violation of the Fifth Amendment. A review of Plaintiff’s Complaint reveals  
10 that out of the 13 federal statutes cited, Plaintiff did not claim a violation of her Fifth Amendment  
11 rights. *See* Dkt. #1 at 6–7. Further, *Tyler* says nothing about whether a state commissioner must  
12 have a valid oath of office on record at the specific offices Plaintiff contacted or how that would  
13 constitute a “taking” under the Fifth Amendment. Plaintiff cites RCW 2.08.080, claiming the  
14 statute requires Commissioner Moore’s oath of office be available of the State of Washington  
15 Secretary of State website. However, RCW 2.08.080 states in full:

19 Every judge of a superior court shall, before entering upon the duties of his or her office,  
20 take and subscribe an oath that he or she will support the Constitution of the United States  
21 and the Constitution of the state of Washington, and will faithfully and impartially  
22 discharge the duties of judge to the best of his or her ability, which oath shall be filed in  
the office of the secretary of state. Such oath or affirmation to be in form substantially the  
same as prescribed for justices of the supreme court.

23 The statute says nothing about whether or how a commissioner’s oath of office should be  
24 accessible to the public.

25 Plaintiff also requests the Court produce “the contract with wet, blue ink signature of  
26 [her] and Witnesses that [she] signed it, and establish a contract between [herself] and the State  
27 of Washington, that [the Court is] using as the basis of [its] assumptions.” Dkt. #75 at 2. This  
28

1 request is not a “showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal  
2 authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.”  
3 LCR 7(h)(1). Plaintiff merely regurgitates a tired argument that has failed in multiple courts and  
4 numerous actions.

5 As Plaintiff has demonstrated neither manifest error nor a new factual or legal basis  
6  
7 meriting reconsideration of the Court’s rulings, her Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

8  
9 DATED this 16<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2023.

10  
11  
12 

13 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28